



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

HJA

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,688	09/17/2003	Koichi Nagoshi	P23994	3984
7055	7590	09/20/2006	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.				PENDER, JOSHUA
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE				ART UNIT
RESTON, VA 20191				PAPER NUMBER
				2174

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/663,688	NAGOSHI ET AL.
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Joshua Pender	2193

**– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –**

### **Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2003.  
2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.  
3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/17/2003.

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Specification***

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In the Claim 28 recites the limitation "a multifunction apparatus having at least a scanning function and not having a facsimile transmission function." in the preamble. However, later in the claim, it recites that "said controller...a menu indicating a facsimile transmission function is displayed on the panel, based on the information regarding the menu, and a facsimile transmission is selected on the menu." (see lines 10-13) It is not clear that how the facsimile transmission

function is displayed on the panel when the apparatus does not have facsimile transmission function as recited in the preamble.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 13, 15-16, 18-19, 22-23, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Parry (US 2003/0030664).

As to claim 1, Parry discloses a multifunction apparatus (50) having at least a copying function (see [0029]), connecting with a server (54) via a network (i.e. LAN, WAN), the apparatus comprising: a panel (100) configured to display a menu (e.g. GUI 102) representing functions of the multifunction apparatus (see paragraph p0073]); a controller (60) configured to communicate with the server (54), to receive information regarding the menu from the sever (see [0038]), and to have the menu displayed on the panel based on the information regarding the menu (see [0050-0051], [0073]).

As to claim 13, this claim differs from claim 1 only in that the limitation “key configured to obtain information regarding a menu from a server” is additionally recited. Parry teaches a key (menu button see paragraph [0073]) configured to obtain information regarding a menu (e.g. GUI 102) from the server (see [0073]); and to have the menu (e.g. GUI 102) displayed on the panel (100) based on the information regarding the menu (e.g. GUI 102), when the key is pressed (see [0073]).

As to claim 15, Parry discloses a server (54) connecting with a multifunction apparatus (see [0029]) via a network (e.g. LAN, WAN), the server (54) comprising; a communicator (40) configured to communicate with the multifunction apparatus via the network (e.g. LAN, WAN); a controller (60) configured to send a signal to the multifunction apparatus for obtaining information regarding a menu (e.g. GUI 102) that is displayed on a panel (100) of the multifunction apparatus (see [0075]), to obtain the information regarding the menu (e.g. GUI 102) from the multifunction apparatus (see [0050-0051], [0073]), and to store the information in a memory (62,64).

As to claim 19, this claim differs from claim 15 only in that the limitation “a key configured to send a signal for obtaining information regarding a menu (e.g. GUI 102) from the multifunction apparatuses” is additionally recited. Parry teaches a

key configured to send a signal for obtaining information regarding a menu (e.g. GUI 102) from the multifunction apparatuses (see [0073]); and to store the information in a memory (62,64), when the key (save button 116) is pressed.

As to claim 22, Parry discloses a server (54) connecting a multifunction apparatus (see [0029]) via a network (LAN, WAN) comprising; a memory (62,64) configured to store information regarding a menu (GUI 102) that is displayed on a panel (100) of the multifunction apparatus (see [0066]); a communicator (40) configured to communicate with the multifunction apparatus (see [0029]) via the network (LAN, WAN); a controller (60) configured to receive a signal from the multifunction apparatus requesting the information regarding a menu (see [0075]), and to transmit the information regarding the menu to the multifunction apparatus (see [0073]).

As to claim 30, Parry discloses a server system including a server (54) and a multifunction apparatus (50) connecting with each other via network (LAN, WAN) comprising; the server comprising; a communicator (40) configured to communicate with the multifunction apparatus (50) via the network (LAN, WAN); a controller (60) configured to send a signal for obtaining information regarding a menu (e.g. GUI 102) that is displayed on a panel (100) of the multifunction apparatus (50), and to obtain the information regarding the menu (e.g. GUI 102) from the multifunction apparatus (50); the multifunction apparatus (50)

comprising; a panel (100) configured to display a menu (e.g. GUI 102) representing functions of the apparatus; a controller (60) configured to communicate with the server (54), to receive information regarding the menu (e.g. GUI 102) from the sever (54), and to have the menu (e.g. GUI 102) displayed on the panel (100) based on the information regarding the menu (see [0073]).

Claim 31 differs from claim 1 only in that claim 31 is a method claim whereas, claim 1 is an apparatus claim. Thus, claim 31 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claim 16, Parry discloses wherein, the information regarding the menu contain information regarding a maximum number of characters that can displayed on the display of the multifunction (see Fig.3).

As to claim 18, Parry discloses wherein the controller (60) being further configured to transmit the information stored in the memory (62,64) to the panel (100) of the multifunction apparatus (21) distinct from the multifunction apparatus (50) from which the information was obtained [0074].

As to claim 22, Parry discloses wherein the information regarding the menu is formed based on first information regarding a maximum number of characters

that can be displayed on the panel of the multifunction apparatus and second information regarding capabilities of the multifunction apparatus (see Fig.3).

3. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kitada (US 2006/0190622).

As to claim 20, Kitada discloses a server (see Fig.1 item 40) connecting a plurality of multifunction apparatuses (see [0022] MFD 10-30), via a network (see [0022] network 100) comprising; a communicator (see [0024] network controller 50) configured to communicate with a plurality of the multifunction apparatuses via the network; a controller (see [0024] network controller 50) configured to send the signal for obtaining information regarding menus (see menus in Figs. 3, 4, 5, and 6) to all of a plurality of the multifunction apparatus, to obtain the information regarding the menus (see menus in Figs. 3, 4, 5, and 6) from all of a plurality of the multifunction apparatuses (see [0022] MFD 10-30), and to store the information regarding the menus in a memory (see Fig.12 item 1420).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 14, 21, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry in view of Kitada.

As to claim 14, note the discussion of Parry above. This claim differs from claim 13 in that the limitation “user ID” is additionally recited. Parry does not teach “user ID”. Kitada teaches using ID (or log in information) to retrieve a directory. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have used a key configured to input user ID as taught by Kitada to the multifunction apparatus of Parry so that the sensitive information can be protected (see [0031]).

As to claim 21, note the discussion of Parry above. This claim differs from claim 19 in that the limitation “connecting a plurality of multifunction apparatuses” is additionally recited. Parry does not teach, “connecting a plurality of multifunction apparatuses”. Kitada teaches a network connecting one, but preferably a plurality of scanning devices, or MFDs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have used connecting a plurality of scanning devices or MFDs as taught by Kitada to the server of Parry so that a user of the scanning device can select one or more destinations (see Abstract)

As to claim 24, note the discussion of Parry above. This claim differs from claim 22 in that the limitation “connecting a plurality of multifunction apparatuses” is

additionally recited. Parry does not teach, "connecting a plurality of multifunction apparatuses". Kitada teaches a network connecting one, but preferably a plurality of scanning devices, or MFDs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have used connecting a plurality of scanning devices or MFDs as taught by Kitada to the server of Parry so that a user of the scanning device can select one or more destinations (see Abstract)

As to claim 25, note the discussion of Parry above. This claim differs from claim 22 in that the limitation "connecting a plurality of multifunction apparatuses" is additionally recited. Parry does not teach, "connecting a plurality of multifunction apparatuses". Kitada teaches a network connecting one, but preferably a plurality of scanning devices, or MFDs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have used connecting a plurality of scanning devices or MFDs as taught by Kitada to the server of Parry so that a user of the scanning device can select one or more destinations (see Abstract)

6. Claims 2-6, 17, 26-27, 28-29, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry in view of Idehara (US 2002/0032736).

As to claim 2, note the discussion of Parry above. Parry does not teach wherein the information regarding the menu is commonly utilized for the multifunction apparatus and for another multifunction apparatus. Idehara teaches wherein the

information regarding the menu is commonly utilized for the multifunction apparatus and for another multifunction apparatus (see [0039]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the copy mode and print mode as taught by Idehara to the multifunction apparatus of Parry installing plural communication equipments having different functions (see [0006]).

As to claim 3, Idehara teaches wherein the information regarding the menu is utilized only for the multifunction apparatus (see [0039]).

As to claim 4, Idehara teaches wherein the information regarding the menu is utilized for at least one of a plurality of functions of the multifunction apparatus (see [0039]).

As to claim 5, Parry teaches wherein at least one of a plurality of functions of the multifunction apparatus is an operation customized for a particular user [0073].

As to claim 6, Idehara teaches wherein the information regarding the menu contains a menu item name (see Fig. 2 items 31a-e), the menu item name indicating a job that the multifunction apparatus performs (see [0038]).

As to claim 17, Idehara teaches wherein the information regarding the menu contains information regarding capabilities of the multifunction apparatus [see 0038].

As to claim 26, Idehara teaches wherein the recipient information includes a fax number of the recipient [0049].

As to claim 27, Idehara teaches wherein the recipient information includes an IP address of the first multifunction apparatus, the second multifunction apparatus utilizing the IP address sent a result of a facsimile transmission to the first multifunction apparatus [see 0080].

As to claim 28, Parry and Idehara are met the claimed limitation recited in claim 26. For example Idehara teaches scanning mode in paragraph [0039]

As to claim 29, Idehara teaches wherein the controller utilizes a scanning function to scan a document, when the facsimile transmission is selected on the menu [see 0039].

Claim 32 differs from claim 2 only in that claim 32 is a method claim whereas, claim 2 is an apparatus claim. Thus, claim 32 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 2 above.

Claim 33 differs from claim 3 only in that claim 33 is a method claim whereas, claim 3 is an apparatus claim. Thus, claim 33 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 3 above.

Claim 34 differs from claim 4 only in that claim 34 is a method claim whereas, claim 4 is an apparatus claim. Thus, claim 34 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 4 above.

Claim 35 differs from claim 5 only in that claim 35 is a method claim whereas, claim 5 is an apparatus claim. Thus, claim 35 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 5 above.

7. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry in view of Idehara and further in view of Fetherolf (2003/0043404).

As to claim 7, note the discussion of Parry above. Idehara teaches wherein the information regarding the menu contains a menu item name, a job ID (see [0038]). Both Parry and Idehara do not teach a job parameter. Fetherolf teaches a job parameter (see [0036]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a job parameter taught by Fetherolf to information regarding a menu taught by Parry modified by Idehara

because although a particular control panel may not have selectable controls for a function that is not supported by a multifunction device, the particular control panel still has a defined region for the function (summary see [0007]).

As to claim 8, Idehara teaches wherein the multifunction apparatus additionally has at least one of a scanning, printing, and a facsimile transmission function (see [0039]) and the job ID includes at least one of copying, printing, scanning and fax transmission (see [0038]).

As to claim 9, Fetherolf teaches job parameter includes at least one of an image type and paper size for copying (306) (see [0036]).

As to claim 10, Fetherolf teaches the job parameter includes at least one of an image type, paper size and resolution for printing (304) (see [0036]).

As to claim 11, Fetherolf teaches wherein the job parameter includes at least one of an image type, paper size, resolution and file format for scanning (208) (see [0036]).

As to claim 12, Fetherolf teaches the job parameter includes at least one of an image type, paper size, resolution and file format for facsimile transmission (202) (see [0036]).

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Holmstead (US 2004/0020389) teaches cache memory system and method for printers. Fetherolf (US 2003/0043404) teaches control panels for multifunction devices.
10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Pender whose telephone number is 571-270-1045. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30am - 5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7772. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Application/Control Number: 10/663,688  
Art Unit: 2179

Page 15

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JP

JOSHUA PENDER

9/6/06

2193



CHANH D. NGUYEN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER